

They know now what we knew before, that education is the key to the future. But, too many of our colleagues have closed their eyes to the past.

Instead of upholding our brilliant past, they want to push us deeper into a dark future.

But, there is a light at the end of the tunnel.

The Senate by a wide margin, Democrats and Republicans, have voted to restore education cuts.

The House should join the Senate.

In addition, the President has submitted a budget, indeed a balanced budget.

The President's budget continues investments in education.

While some would cut the education budget by 20 percent, the President proposes to increase the budget by 20 percent over its 1993 level.

While some would cut the education budget over 7 years, the President invests \$61 billion more in that budget.

The President would invest \$1 billion more in title I education funds for basic and advanced skills assistance.

The President's budget increases Pell Grants, Safe and Drug Free School Funds, Charter Schools, the School to Work Program and Goals 2000.

The President's budget invests \$2 billion in Technology Literacy Challenge—bringing to the fingertips of every child in America access to computer training and learning.

And, the President's budget provides a \$10,000 tuition tax deduction to help working families afford college.

I urge my colleagues to join the Senate and join the President.

Now is not the time to give up on our children.

America's future should be as bright as its past.

COMMENTS ON CORRESPONDENTS DINNER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I had no intention really of using this time today. It is more by circumstance that I take it.

Last night, after our long day's work here, I went home. I was having my dinner with my wife, and we turned on the TV and I was checking on C-SPAN to see if in fact we were having any further floor action on subjects that interested me. I got into the Correspondents Dinner downtown in Washington.

I believe that is a dinner traditionally where the correspondents and the top leaders of our country get together and, in a good natured and good humored way, poke fun at each other; they get together and have some time of friendship and fellowship, take time out from their schedules. It is usually an enjoyable circumstance.

I would say that I thought that President Clinton did an extremely good job of carrying the mood, making

a fine presentation. I enjoyed what he had to say. I think everybody there did. I think Speaker GINGRICH did also. I thought his remarks were appropriate, on target, amusing, and it was a good thing going on.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we had a monologue from a gentleman, who I guess is a talk show host, named Don Imus, that I think went well beyond anything that should be tolerated on the public airways. I realize it is a free country, and I am in no way suggesting that people do not have a right to say or do what they want, to speak what they want. I would never take that right away from Mr. Imus.

But I certainly feel that what he had to say went beyond inappropriate. It was excruciating, it was embarrassing, it was certainly blood sport. It was far more mean than it was amusing. I consider it not washing dirty laundry, but reveling in dirty laundry. And I wonder why anybody would take joy or have any particular participation in something that certainly went beyond decency and went beyond respect, particularly when we are talking about the President of the United States and the Speaker of the House, of this institution.

I make these observations because I hope that the people who organize this dinner in the future will get principal speakers who will deal with the spirit of what this evening was supposed to apply itself to, which is in fact some good natured time of fellowship among people who have tremendously difficult decisions to make, tremendously difficult jobs here, who work long days at great personal sacrifice.

I think we are certainly all human beings and we all have our little failures, but to go and systematically try and demean people, which is what the purpose of the monologue was, seems to me to be immensely disrespectful, and, again, I hope those folks will not have a speaker like that again. I think it ruined the evening.

Fortunately, this is a free country. We are very happy that this is a free country. We just passed in this body something called the V chip, so we do not have to watch violence on TV. My TV set has a V chip already. It is called an off button, and, as a free citizen in a free country, I exercise my prerogative to turn off Mr. Imus. I hope others will do the same if they feel the same way I do about his performance last night.

GUN CONTROL AND CRIME CONTROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to talk about the vote that we just had here recently on the repeal of the assault weapons ban and measures to enforce statutes with regard to criminals who use a weapon in

the commission of a crime. I want to talk about our judicial system at the Federal level and how it impacts at the local level.

During the debate, I only had about 30 seconds. It was a limited debate. This was a debate that could have gone on on this floor for a long time, so I understand why the Committee on Rules had to limit the debate.

But one thing really I believe is very clear, is that there are, and I do not question the sincerity from two different groups that we saw in this debate, you have got those people who believe with all their heart that if we just get all the guns off the streets, that there will be no crime in our society. Then there are those, of whom I am in the camp, that believes gun control is not crime control, and understands the right of free citizens to own and bear arms and the protections of the second amendment of the Constitution.

But, folks, I do recognize, and those of us who live in this town in Washington and have to work here, that when you go out in those streets and you see those homes and you see the businesses here in the city whereby it is illegal to possess a handgun, and in those homes and in those businesses are citizens who live in fear, it is clear that the wrong people are behind bars in this town, as the thugs continue to roam the streets. So as we live in a free society, if in fact you live in fear, you are not free.

□ 1445

This bill was about giving law abiding citizens the opportunity to live in freedom and not in fear.

What did not get sufficient time in the debate, what I believe was the substance of the bill, was increasing the penalties for the use of a weapon in the commission of a crime. In the last session of Congress, there was a great debate about increasing the penalties on criminals that use a firearm, and it was knocked down in the 1994 crime act. I was very upset that that happened. Let me talk for a moment about that.

In this bill, what we have done is, if a thug walks into a 7-Eleven and he has got, stuck in his pants, he has a handgun right here, for the fact that he just walks in there and he has it and if his buddy pulls his gun, they both are arrested. For the fact that he had possession of a firearm in the commission of that crime, even though he never pulled it, it is a mandatory minimum of 5 years. I believe that deterrent is very important. If he pulls that weapon and he brandishes that weapon to incite fear in that individual, to rob them or hurt them or maim them, even to threaten to kill them, minimum 10 years. If in fact he discharges that firearm, 20 years.

You might say, my gosh, Congressman, that is very harsh. You are right. That is harsh. Because there are those of us that believe if you use a weapon in the commission of a crime, it better be a harsh penalty. And let us send

that signal out there to the thugs, because to me the real assault weapon is the thug who pulls the trigger.

Let us talk about theories of punishment in our judicial system. The theories of punishment, as I serve on the Committee on the Judiciary, I talk about it so often with my colleagues, theories of punishment are prevention, education, rehabilitation, restitution, retribution, and deterrence. So in prevention, whether they are programs in our communities for youth activities in our cities and towns or multi-drug task forces, or take education, the DARE Program, in our schools, rehabilitation, whether it is by alcohol, drug or schooling within our prisons. How about restitution to the victim, retribution to the criminal and deterrence. We need a proper balance of all of these in our society. There is a great need, because of victims crying out that they are not being heard. And when they are not heard, it breeds individual vigilantism in our society.

So we need a proper balance. That is what we are trying to strike here in our society for the benefit of all mankind.

A BUSY WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we are concluding today's session, the session for the week, going home. And it has been a very busy week. I will not say it has been a very fruitful week but certainly we have been very busy.

I am looking forward to going home and talking to my constituents for 12 hours in an all night teach-in that I will be holding at the Borough of Manhattan Community College from 7 p.m. Saturday night to 7 a.m. Sunday morning. We are having this all night teach-in because there is just not enough time to talk about all of the things that need to be talked about in this very critical period in the life of our Nation. There are forces moving very rapidly and overnight they want to remake America.

The Speaker of the House has said that politics is war without blood and that he wants to remake America, and we are trying to remake America in a very short period of time. The fallout is hurting a lot of people.

In New York State and New York City it seems that the Governor and the mayor want to get ahead of the Republican majority here in Congress. They have instituted certain cruel harassing programs that are worse than anything we have yet passed here in this House. So our people need to know a whole lot about what is going on. We need to talk about just exactly what is happening, and there is not enough time to do it in a regular day.

Mr. Speaker, also, if we want to get people together who are experts and

can throw some light on this subject, they are too busy, they cannot stay long or, if we have an opportunity to talk, the amount of time available is too little. So I will have a marathon teach-in, all night long, 12 hours.

We are going to talk about the fiscal future of New York City, the fiscal future of New York City. The discussion begins with a discussion of what is happening here in Washington because the fiscal future of New York City is inextricably interwoven with the policies that are generated here in Washington, our Capital. I am going to start by talking about the fact that New York City is often discussed on the floor of the House of Representatives. People often talk about New York City and New York State. It is the favorite target of the Speaker of the House. Speaker GINGRICH often refers to New York State and New York City as a welfare State and a welfare city. For that reason, the people of New York need to understand the perspective of our relationship with Washington better.

We are called a welfare State, welfare city. We are often accused of draining, being a drain on the Nation, and yet New York City pays taxes to the tune of \$9 billion more into the Federal Government than it received back in 1994. New York City, the city alone, paid taxes of \$9 billion more to the Federal Government than it received back from the Federal Government in various forms of aid.

In that same year, 1994, New York State paid \$18.9 billion more. The total of New York State, the city and all the other parts of New York State, paid \$18.9 billion more to the Federal Government than we received back from the Federal Government. The year before that, in 1993, New York State paid \$23 billion more to the Federal Government than we received back from the Federal Government. So New Yorkers need to know in this all-night teach-in we are going to start by talking about the fact that our city is not bankrupt. Our city is not broke. Our State is not bankrupt. Our State is not broke.

Mr. Speaker, it is baffling. We do not quite understand why Members on the floor of the House of Representatives like to single out New York City. New York City is often singled out, and New York State, for its high expenditures on Medicare and Medicaid. Well, after we take away our high expenditures for Medicare and Medicaid, which are the highest in the country, I admit that. I can think of no more noble way to expend public funds than by taking care of the sick, the infirm, the elderly in nursing homes. That is a noble way to expend funds.

Yes, if there is waste, we want to get rid of the waste. If there is corruption, we want to get rid of the corruption. We do not have any money to spend for anything except the intended purposes. But even if we take away the high expenditures for Medicare and Medicaid, New York City is still paying more and New York State is still paying more to

the Federal Government than they are getting back from the Federal Government. Stop and seriously consider it.

According to the formulas in the way things are arranged here in Washington, New Yorkers, New York City people have to pay for 25 percent of their Medicare costs, and then again the State pays another 25 percent, which means that New York State pays 50 percent of its Medicare costs while Mississippi only pays a small fraction of its Medicare costs. Most of it is paid by the Federal Government, and other Southern States pay only a small fraction of their total Medicare and Medicaid costs. The rest is paid for by the Federal Government.

The result of all this is that in 1994, the Southern States combined—I mention the Southern States because often the Blue Dogs and the Republicans and various people are the ones who are criticizing New York. Certainly the Speaker of the House is from Georgia and he is a major critic of New York. The Southern States combined receive \$625 billion more from the Federal Government in terms of aid than they pay in to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, Mississippi gets the highest amount. In 1994, Mississippi got \$6 billion more from the Federal Government than the people of Mississippi paid in taxes to the Federal Government. In Georgia, in 1994, the people got \$2 billion more from the Federal Government than the people of Georgia paid to the Federal Government. The county in the country, in all of the United States of America, the one county which received the highest per capita in Federal aid, the highest amount of money in Federal aid was the county represented by the Speaker of the House.

Speaker GINGRICH's county received more money per person from the Federal Government than any other county in the United States of America. So why is New York City constantly being lambasted? Why is New York State constantly being lambasted? I suppose we should call upon some psychologists and students of human nature because not only was it the case in 1994, when New York paid \$18.9 billion more to the Federal Government than it received in Federal aid, but in 1993, we paid \$23 billion more to the Federal Government than we received in Federal aid. But this has been the case for the last 20 years.

The last 20 years, New York State has consistently paid more into the Federal Government than it has received from the Federal Government. Why do the States that are recipients of the money who always pay less to the Federal Government than they receive become the critics of New York? That is a challenging study of human nature. Why are we kicked in the pants and why are we spat upon because of our generosity?

If we were to have complete States' rights as some Members are proclaiming economic States' rights, and if everything was block granted and the